

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15, 19-24 and 33-40 Pending.
2. Claims 16-18, 25-32 Canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/11/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per Applicants arguments regarding Claims 1 and 6-8, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly, Examiner notes that the combination of Dutta, Rickard, and Ford must be Examined together in order to realize the claimed limitations. In this case, Rickard when combined with Ford disclose that the score is inversely based on the number of documents on the server of Dutta and that the score is distributed to the documents on the server. In the cited sections, Rickard introduced the concepts of

inverse frequency weighting and Ford adds the idea of ranking based on the number of items in a category. Examiner notes that if a web site has only a single category, representative of all of the pages for that site then the number of items in that category would be equal to the number of items on the page. When combined, Rickard and Ford create the idea of inversely weighting a document based on the number of documents in its category/domain. Examiner further notes that if this method is being used, then it inherently causes all of the pages in that category/domain to have the same score (e.g. the score is distributed) because they all reside in the same domain and the score is based on the number of pages in the domain.

As per Applicants arguments regarding Claim 2, Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted above in regard to Claims 1, the score of Dutta, Rickard, and Ford is based on the number of said at least one other document. Also, as pointed out by the previous Examiner, the number of said at least one other document could reasonable be construed to indicate a weighting of at least one other document.

As per Applicants arguments regarding Claims 3 and 4, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner notes, as above, that if this method is being used, then it inherently causes all of the pages in that category/domain to have the same score (e.g. the score is distributed) because they all reside in the same domain and the score is based on the number of pages in the domain. As such, the cited disclosure of Dutta, as previously

modified, indicates that the score is assigned in proportion to at least one score assigned to at least one of said at least one other document.

As per Applicants arguments regarding Claim 5, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner notes that Dutta, in the cited section, is discussing weighting based on inlinks and outlinks.

As per Applicants arguments regarding Claim 12, Examiner notes that Applicants arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Examiner notes that no rational was given for why Dutta fails to disclose the claim limitations or how the limitations differ from Dutta.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-14, 19-24 and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta (US 2002/0078045 A1) in view of Rickard (US 2004/0034633 A1) and further in view of Ford et al. (US 6,963,867 B2).

As per claim 1 Dutta is directed to in a computing system comprising at least one processor and a memory communicatively coupled to said at least one processor, a method for assigning a score to a document of a plurality of structurally linked documents in order to improve the accuracy of a ranking of said document comprising: locating said document on a Web server defined by at least one of: (A) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages with the same symbolic host name (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server could have same symbolic host name), (B) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages associated with the same domain (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server is a domain), and (C) a server having a plurality of Web pages associated with the same IP address (not covered since the claim offers a choice of servers) wherein said document has at least one backlink from at least one other document of said plurality of structurally linked documents, (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 9-10): selecting said document from said plurality of structurally linked documents (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 9-10), storing the score in said memory (Dutta, page 5, paragraph 0035).

Dutta does not teach calculating said score in inverse proportion to the number of documents hosted on said Web server resulting and distributing said score among said number of documents, whereby when said number of documents increases said score decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score increases.

Rickard teaches calculating said score in inverse proportion to the number of documents hosted on said Web server resulting and distributing said score among said number of documents, whereby when said number of documents increases said score decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score increases (Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Dutta by teachings of Rickard to include calculating said score in inverse proportion to the number of documents hosted on said Web server resulting and distributing said score among said number of documents, whereby when said number of documents increases said score decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score increases because assigning score based on inverse proportion gives a better measure of the importance of a document.

Dutta does not teach number of documents located on web server.

Ford et al. teaches number of documents located on web server (.Ford et al., abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Dutta by teachings of Ford et al. to include number of documents located on web server because in order to calculate score based on the number of other documents, the number of documents have to be determined.

As per claim 2 Dutta as modified is directed to assigning the score to the document in proportion to the number of said at least one other document (Dutta, page

8, paragraph 0047, lines 27-28, wherein "number of documents" could mean "weight value").

As per claim 3 Dutta as modified is directed to assigning the score in proportion to at least one score assigned to at least one of said at least one other document (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0013, lines 7-9).

As per claim 4 Dutta as modified is directed to assigning the score in proportion to (A) the number of said at least one other document and (B) at least one score assigned to at least one of said at least one other document (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0013, lines 7-9; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 5 Dutta as modified is directed to assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of outlinks of at least one of said at least one other document (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 8-10).

As per claim 6 Dutta as modified is directed to said assigning includes assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of documents located on the same domain as said document (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server is a domain; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 7 Dutta as modified is directed to said assigning includes assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of documents having the same symbolic host name as said document (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server could have same symbolic host name; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 8 Dutta as modified is directed to said assigning includes assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of documents associated with the same internet protocol (IP) address as said document (not covered since claim 1 offers a choice of servers).

As per claim 9 Dutta as modified is directed to assigning the score to the document based upon summing the scores of the at least one other document linking to said first document (Dutta, page 9, paragraph 0055, lines 29-33, Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 10 Dutta as modified is directed to the plurality of structurally linked documents are Web pages having hyperlinks and the document is a Web page (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 8-10).

As per claim 11 Dutta as modified is directed to including outputting the score of the document to a component of a Web search service (Dutta, page 10, paragraph 0056, lines 15-16).

As per claim 12 Dutta as modified is directed to including assigning a preferred set of documents scores higher than an average minimum score (Dutta, page 9, paragraph 0055, lines 3-9).

As per claim 13 Dutta as modified is directed to the set of preferred documents is based on at least one of Nielsen ratings, ratings assigned by humans, Web page usage patterns extracted from ISP proxy logs, Web page usage patterns extracted from a search engine and documents specified according to a user preference (Dutta, page 9, paragraph 0055, lines 6-9).

As per claim 14 Dutta as modified is directed to including altering the score of the document based upon an additional scoring technique to said assigning the score (Dutta, page 9, paragraph 0055, lines 1-39; page 9, paragraph 0055, lines 17-22).

As per claim 19 Dutta is directed to in a computing system comprising at least one processor and a memory communicatively coupled to said at least one processor a method for assigning a score to a document of a plurality of structurally linked documents in order to improve the accuracy of a ranking of said document comprising:

locating said document on a Web server defined by at least one of: (A) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages with the same symbolic host name (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server could have same symbolic host name), (B) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages associated with the same domain (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server is a domain), and (C) a server having a plurality of Web pages associated with the same IP address (not covered since the claim offers a choice of servers) wherein the document has at least one backlink from at least one source document of the plurality of structurally linked documents (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 9-10), and storing the score in memory (Dutta, page 5, paragraph 0035).

Dutta does not teach calculating the score of the document in proportion to at least one score associated with at least one of the at least one source document, calculating the score of the document in proportion to at least one score associated with at least one of the at least one source document located on said web server resulting in said score being assigned to said document by being divided among said number of documents, whereby when said number of documents increases said score decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score increases.

Rickard does teach calculating the score of the document in proportion to at least one score associated with at least one of the at least one source document (Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12), calculating the score of the document in proportion to at least one score associated with at least one of the at least one source document located on said web server resulting in said score being assigned to said document by

being divided among said number of documents, whereby when said number of documents increases said score decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score increases (Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Dutta by teachings of Rickard to include calculating the score of the document in proportion to at least one score associated with at least one of the at least one source document, calculating the score of the document in proportion to at least one score associated with at least one of the at least one source document located on said web server resulting in said score being assigned to said document by being divided among said number of documents, whereby when said number of documents increases said score decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score increases because calculating score based on inverse proportion gives a better measure of the importance of a document.

Dutta does not teach at least one source document.

Ford et al. teaches at least one source document (Ford et al., abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Dutta by teachings of Ford et al. to include at least one source document because in order to calculate score based on the number of other documents, the number of documents have to be determined.

As per claim 20 Dutta is directed to the score is calculated inversely proportional to the number of said at least one source document located on the same Web server (.Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 21 Dutta is directed to the score is calculated inversely proportional to the number of said at least one source document having the same symbolic host name (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server could have same symbolic host name; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 22 Dutta is directed to the score is calculated inversely proportional to the number of said at least one source document associated with the same domain(Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server is a domain; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 23 Dutta is directed to the score is calculated inversely proportional to the number of said at least one source document associated with the same internet protocol (IP) address (not covered since claim 19 offers a choice of servers).

As per claim 24 Dutta is directed to the plurality of structurally linked documents are Web pages having hyperlinks and the document is a Web page (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 8-10).

As per claim 33 Dutta is directed to a computer readable medium comprising computer executable modules comprising computer executable instructions for assigning a score to a document (Dutta, page 4, paragraph 0034, lines 11-13; page 5, paragraph 0034, line 1) of a plurality of structurally linked documents to prevent document ranking manipulation, wherein the document is located on a Web server and has at least one backlink from at least one other document of the plurality of structurally linked documents, the modules comprising (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 9-10): means for locating said document on a Web server defined by at least one of: (A) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages with the same symbolic host name (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server could have same symbolic host name), (B) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages associated with the same domain (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server is a domain), and (C) a server having a plurality of Web pages associated with the same IP address (not covered since the claim offers a choice of servers) and said document has at least one backlink from at least one other document of said plurality of structurally linked documents, (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 9-10): means for storing the score in memory (Dutta, page 5, paragraph 0035).

Dutta does not teach means for assigning said score to said document in inverse proportion to the number of documents located on said Web server resulting in said score being assigned to said document by being distributed among said number of documents, including said document, whereby when said number of documents

increases said score assigned to said document decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score assigned to said document increases.

Rickard teaches means for assigning said score to said document in inverse proportion to the number of documents located on said Web server resulting in said score being assigned to said document by being distributed among said number of documents, including said document, whereby when said number of documents increases said score assigned to said document decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score assigned to said document increases (Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Dutta by teachings of Rickard to include a teaches means for assigning said score to said document in inverse proportion to the number of documents located on said Web server resulting in said score being assigned to said document by being distributed among said number of documents, including said document, whereby when said number of documents increases said score assigned to said document decreases and when said number of documents decreases said score assigned to said document increases because assigning score based on inverse proportion gives a better measure of the importance of a document.

Dutta does not teach number of documents located on web server.

Ford et al. teaches number of documents located on web server (.Ford et al., abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Dutta by teachings of Ford et al. to include number of documents located on web server because in order to calculate score based on the number of other documents, the number of documents have to be determined.

As per claim 34 Dutta as modified is directed to means for assigning the score to the document in proportion to the number of said at least one other document (Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 35 Dutta as modified is directed to means for assigning the score in proportion to at least one score assigned to at least one of said at least one other document (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0013, lines 7-9; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 36 Dutta as modified is directed to means for assigning the score in proportion to (A) the number of said at least one other document and (B) at least one score assigned to at least one of said at least one other document (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0013, lines 7-9; page 8, Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 37 Dutta as modified is directed to means for assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of outlinks of at least one of said at least one other document (Dutta, page 2, paragraph 0010, lines 8-10).

As per claim 38 Dutta as modified is directed to means for assigning includes means for assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of documents located on a Web server with the same symbolic host name as said document name (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server could have same symbolic host name; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 39 Dutta as modified is directed to means for assigning includes means for assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of documents located on the same domain as said document (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server is a domain; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

As per claim 40 Dutta as modified is directed to means for assigning includes means for assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of documents associated with the same internet protocol (IP) address as said document (Dutta, figure 2, number 42, wherein each information content server is a domain; Rickard, paragraph 0067, lines 1-12; Ford et al., abstract).

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta (US 2002/0078045 A1) view of Rickard (US 2004/0034633 A1) and further in view of Ford et al. (US 6,963,867 B2) and even further in view of Guerber (US 2,935,732).

As per claim 15 Dutta as modified still does not teach comparing the score against said additional scoring technique to discover anomalous results.

Guerber does teach comparing the score against said additional scoring technique to discover anomalous results (Guerber, column 7, lines 20-23, wherein if no equality exists then no appropriate signal is sent).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Dutta as modified with teachings of Guerber to include comparing the score against a second scoring technique to discover anomalous results because the result of such comparison proves that the scoring was done appropriately (.Guerber, column 7, lines 26-27).

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Hicks whose telephone number is (571) 272-2670. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00a - 5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael J Hicks
Art Unit 2165
Phone: (571) 272-2670
Fax: (571) 273-2670

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2165